19 20

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

22

23

24

25

CITY OF OAKLAND AND PORT OF OAKLAND,

26

27

28

AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIM

Defendants.

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY Injunction

COOLEY LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW

C. STUART DECLARATION CASE No.: 3:24-CV-02311-TSH I, Christopher Stuart, declare as follows:

- 1. I am a Deputy City Attorney for the City and County of San Francisco. I submit this declaration in connection with the City and County of San Francisco's Reply Brief in Support of Plaintiff City and County of San Francisco's Reply to Defendant City of Oakland's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction. I declare that the following is true to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, and that if called upon to testify, I could and would testify to the following.
- 2. On April 29, 2024, City of Oakland ("Oakland") first raised their argument that they were not a proper party and sought clarification on whether it was San Francisco's intention to "name and serve only the Port of Oakland." Attached as **Exhibit A** is a true and correct copy of an April 29, 2024 email I received from counsel for the City of Oakland, Christina Lum, asserting that San Francisco should sue the Port of Oakland.
- 3. Over a period of months Counsel for San Francisco and Oakland have engaged in numerous meet and confer conversations regarding whether Oakland is a proper party to this lawsuit. Those conversations have occurred telephonically and by email.
- 4. After San Francisco filed its Motion for a Preliminary Injunction, Oakland again requested to be dismissed from the case and asserted that Oakland would file a motion for summary judgment if not dismissed.
- 5. On October 3 and 4, 2024, I had meet and confer calls with counsel for Oakland regarding a proposed stipulation to dismiss Oakland subject to Oakland agreeing they will agree to be bound by any injunction this Court issues against the Port. Oakland declined to enter such a stipulation and explained they could not enter such a stipulation because it "implies Oakland has jurisdiction, or some control, over OAK, and we still have the problem with the ability to bind Council." Attached as **Exhibit B** is a true and correct copy of an email thread between me and counsel for Oakland discussing a potential stipulation to dismiss Oakland.

Document 68

Filed 10/22/24

Page 3 of 4

Case 3:24-cv-02311-TSH

ATTESTATION PURSUANT TO CIVIL LOCAL RULE 5-1(h) I hereby attest that I obtained concurrence in the filing of this document from the signatory. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Dated: October 22, 2024 COOLEY LLP /s/ John Hemann John Hemann Attorney for Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendant City and County of San Francisco

COOLEY LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW